

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00051 01 OF 04 172221Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

NSCE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 /090 W
----- 122737

O P 171912Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1426

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0051

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF
FEB 17, 1976

REF: MBFR VIENNA 0047 (DTG 171420"FEB 76 NOFORN)

FOLLOWING FOR RAPID INFORMATION OF INTERESTED ADDRESSEES IS
PORTION OF RECORD OF INFORMAL SESSION OF FEB 17, 1976 DEALING
WITH NEW EASTERN REDUCTION PROPOSAL. FULL RECORD AND SUMMARY
WILL FOLLOW.

1. AFTER CRITICIZING WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DEC 16, KHLESTOV CONTINUED
THAT EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE SURE THAT, IF THERE WAS GOODWILL,
THE MOST COMPLEX INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS COULD BE SOLVED TO
THE SATISFACTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THIS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00051 01 OF 04 172221Z

HAD BEEN DEMONSTRATED IN PARTICULAR BY THE RESULTS OF THE

SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED EUROPEAN CONFERENCE, WHICH HAD CREATED MORE FAVORABLE CONDITIONS FOR THE WORK OF THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS. THE EASTERN GOVERNMENTS CONSIDERED IT NECESSARY TO SUPPLEMENT POLITICAL DETENTE IN EUROPE WITH MILITARY DETENTE. THE EASTERN COUNTRIES DID NOT INTEND TO RELAX THEIR EFFORTS DIRECTED AT ACHIEVING THESE GOALS. GUIDED BY THESE CONSIDERATIONS, THE DELEGATIONS OF THE GDR, POLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE USSR, ON THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THEIR GOVERNMENTS, WERE SUBMITTING IN THE PRESENT SESSION A NEW PROPOSAL, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH WAS TO MOVE THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS INTO A QUALITATIVELY NEW STAGE IN WHICH IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO WORK OUT A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE AGREEMENT.

2. KHLESTOV THEN GAVE WESTERN REPS RUSSIAN LANGUAGE VERSION OF NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL INFORMAL TRANSLATION OF WHICH BY US DEL FOLLOWS:

BEGIN TEXT:

1. IN THE FIRST STAGE - IN THE COURSE OF 1976 - THE REDUCTION IS TO BE CARRIED OUT IN CENTRAL EUROPE OF THE ARMED FORCES ONLY OF THE USSR AND THE USA BY AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE (APPROXIMATELY 2-3 PERCENT) OF THE OVERALL NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE WARSAW PACT AND OF NATO IN THIS AREA.

2. IN THIS REGARD A SPECIFIC REDUCTION IS ENVISAGED ON EACH SIDE OF 300 TANKS - 2-3 TANK REGIMENTS, 2-3 BRIGADES; 54 NUCLEAR-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT 1/ (SOVIET "FITTER" AND AMERICAN F-4) AND ALSO AN EQUAL NUMBER (COMMENT: FORMULATION AMBIGUOUS AS TO ACTUAL AMOUNT INVOLVED. END COMMENT) OF OPERATION-TACTICAL MISSILE LAUNCHERS (SOVIET "SCUD-B" AND AMERICAN "PERSHING") (COMMENT: KHLESTOV USED TERM "BALLISTIC LAUNCHERS" IN READING OUT AN INFORMAL TRANSLATION PREPARED BY SOVIET DEL. END COMMENT) TOGETHER WITH A DEFINITE NUMBER OF NUCLEAR WARHEADS FOR THESE DELIVERY SYSTEMS; 36 AIR DEFENSE GUIDED MISSILE LAUNCHERS (SOVIET "SAM-2" AND AMERICAN "NIKE HERCULES," "HAWK"); ONE ARMY CORPS HEADQUARTERS WITH COMBAT SUPPORT AND SERVICE UNITS.

3. WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF AN AGREEMENT ON THE REDUCTION OF SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES, ALL OTHER STATES HAVING FORCES IN SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00051 01 OF 04 172221Z

CENTRAL EUROPE ARE TO ASSUME CLEARLY FORMULATED OBLIGATIONS TO "FREEZE" AT THE PRESENT LEVEL THE NUMERICAL STRENGTH OF THEIR ARMED FORCES AND TO REDUCE THESE FORCES IN THE SUBSEQUENT STAGE (1977-1978) SO THAT AS A RESULT OF THE REDUCTIONS IN BOTH SIDES ALL STATES PARTICIPATING IN THEM WILL HAVE REDUCED THEIR ARMED FORCES BY AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE.

4. THE REDUCTION OF FORCES IS TO BE EFFECTED BY ENTIRE MILITARY

SUB-UNITS AND OTHER FORMATIONS TOGETHER WITH THE CORRESPONDING ARMAMENTS AND COMBAT EQUIPMENT, AND NOT BY INDIVIDUAL SERVICEMEN TAKEN FROM DIFFERENT UNITS.

5. THE REDUCED SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCES ARE TO BE WITHDRAWN TO THEIR OWN TERRITORY, WHERE THEY ARE TO BE DISBANDED. END TEXT.
1/ LITERALLY "DELIVERY AIRCRAFT"

3. KHESTOV SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO GIVE A FURTHER EXPLANATION OF THIS PROPOSAL. EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WISHED TO STRESS THAT THIS NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL, WHICH FULLY CONFORMED TO THE PRINCIPLES AGREED IN THE PREPARATORY TALKS, CONTAINED A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT ELEMENTS WHICH MET TO A VERY LARGE EXTENT DESIRES EXPRESSED BY THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS. EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES CONTINUED TO BELIEVE THAT PARTICIPATION OF ALL THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN REDUCTION OF THEIR FORCES FROM THE VERY BEGINNING WAS THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND JUST APPROACH TO MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. AS WAS KNOWN, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE WESTERN POSITION, EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD EARLIER PROPOSED THAT IN EACH OF THE FIRST TWO STAGES OF REDUCTION, IN 1975-1976, SOVIET AND US TROOPS WOULD BE REDUCED FIRST AND THE FORCES OF OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ONLY AFTER THAT. NOW, EASTERN REPS WERE PREPARED TO TAKE A NEW AND FURTHER STEP IN THIS DIRECTION AND TO ENVISAGE THAT, DURING THE FIRST STAGE, IN 1976, ONLY SOVIET AND US FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED. THE OTHER STATES HAVING THEIR TROOPS IN CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD CARRY OUT REDUCTIONS OF THEIR FORCES IN A SECOND STAGE, IN 1977-1978. THUS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF REACHING A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION, THE EASTERN DELEGATIONS WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE WESTERN CONCEPT OF A TWO-PHASE REDUCTION OF FORCES. PREVIOUSLY, THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES HAD SUPPORTED THE IDEA THAT CONCRETE AND SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS SHOULD BE AGREED UPON FROM THE VERY OUTSET WITH RESPECT TO ALL STATES WHO WERE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00051 01 OF 04 172221Z

IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. NOW, EASTERN REPS WERE PREPARED TO AGREE TO SPECIFY IN AN AGREEMENT THAT, IN THE FIRST STAGE OF REDUCTIONS, SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS WOULD BE ASSUMED ONLY BY THE SOVIET UNION AND THE US. OBLIGATIONS OF THIS KIND FOR THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPATING STATES WOULD BE WORKED OUT IN THE COURSE OF SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATIONS. IN THE FIRST STAGE, THESE REMAINING COUNTRIES WOULD CONFINE THEMSELVES TO UNDERTAKING A COMMITMENT OF A GENERAL CHARACTER WHICH WOULD ONLY DEFINE THE FINAL VOLUME AND TIMING OF THEIR REDUCTIONS. CONSEQUENTLY, IN THIS QUESTION AS WELL, EASTERN REPS HAD TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT ONE OF THE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE NATO COUNTRIES' POSITION, ACCORDING TO WHICH AGREEMENT ON A FIRST PHASE OF REDUCTIONS SHOULD CONTAIN SPECIFIC COMMITMENTS FOR THE SOVIET UNION AND THE US, AND ONLY GENERAL COMMITMENTS FOR THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. AT THE SAME TIME, THE EASTERN PROPOSAL PROVIDED FOR EQUIVALENCE OF COMMITMENTS

AND A GENUINELY MUTUAL CHARACTER OF REDUCTIONS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00051 02 OF 04 172218Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /084 W
----- 122705

O P 171912Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1427

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0051

FROM US REP MBFR

4. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT EASTERN REPS WERE TAKING INTO ACCOUNT TO A CERTAIN EXTENT ONE FURTHER ELEMENT OF THE WESTERN POSITION, NAMELY, A FREEZE OF MANPOWER OF THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST SOVIET AND AMERICAN FORCE REDUCTION. EASTERN REPS WERE READY TO AGREE TO THIS IF, DURING THE PERIOD OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET TROOP REDUCTIONS, THERE WOULD REALLY BE NO INCREASE IN THE OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS' FORCES. ONLY IN THIS EVENT WOULD THE CONFIDENCE OF PARTICIPANTS BE CONSOLIDATED. THIS STEP WOULD PROMOTE SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS WHICH PARTICIPANTS NOW FACED. IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS MEASURE WOULD DEMONSTRATE THE POLITICAL WILL OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES TO PUT A LIMIT ON THE BUILD-UP OF ARMED FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE AND WOULD ELIMINATE THE POSSIBILITY OF GAMBLING WITH SPEECHES CHARGING ALL KINDS OF ALLEGED EXISTING "THREATS" TO THE SECURITY OF THE STATES INVOLVED.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00051 02 OF 04 172218Z

5. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT IT WAS THE FIRM CONVICTION OF THE EASTERN REPS THAT THE ADVANTAGES OF THE NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL WERE ALSO TO BE FOUND IN THE FACT THAT IT PROVIDED FOR THE REDUCTION OF ALL ARMED SERVICES, NAMELY IN GROUND AND AIR FORCES. IN THIS REGARD, IT WAS INTENDED TO REDUCE NOT ONLY MILITARY PERSONNEL, BUT ARMAMENTS AND COMBAT EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS. IN CONTRAST TO THE WEST, EASTERN REPS PROPOSED THAT NUCLEAR WEAPONS SHOULD BE REDUCED NOT ONLY BY THE US BUT ALSO BY THE SOVIET UNION. IN PROPOSING THIS, THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES PROCEEDED FROM THEIR POSITION OF PRINCIPLE. THE ESSENCE OF THIS POSITION WAS THAT MILITARY DETENTE IN CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD NOT BE STABLE IF REDUCTIONS DID NOT COVER NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WHICH REPRESENTED THE MOST DANGEROUS MEANS OF WARFARE, ESPECIALLY IN THE CONDITIONS OF DENSELY POPULATED CENTRAL EUROPE.

6. KHLESTOV SAID IT WAS A GENERALLY RECOGNIZED, AND AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE EASTERN PLAN, THAT REDUCTIONS SHOULD COVER NUCLEAR WEAPONS. FURTHER, THE REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS SHOULD NOT OF ITS NATURE BE A LIMITED AND ONE-TIME ACTION AS SUGGESTED BY THE WESTERN COUNTRIES. THIS WAS WHY EASTERN REPS WERE PROPOSING THE FOLLOWING: FIRST, THE USSR AND THE USA SHOULD CARRY OUT REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS NOT ONLY IN THE FIRST STAGE IN 1976 -- AS KNOWN, THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DEC 16 PROVIDED FOR REDUCTION OF US NUCLEAR WEAPONS ONLY IN THE FIRST PHASE -- BUT ALSO IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL IN 1977-1978. SECOND, THE MEANS OF DELIVERY OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS SHOULD BE REDUCED BY ALL PARTICIPANTS HAVING THEM IN CENTRAL EUROPE, THE US AND THE USSR IN A FIRST STAGE AND BY THE REMAINDER OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND STAGE.

7. KHLESTOV SAID WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES HAD STRESSED THAT, WHILE WILLING TO ASSUME ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO REDUCE A CERTAIN PART OF US NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE AREA AS PROVIDED IN THEIR PROPOSAL OF DEC 16, THEY WERE NOT ASKING THAT SUCH AN OBLIGATION BE ASSUMED BY THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES. IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT THAT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD STRESSED THAT THEY WERE NOT ASKING SOCIALIST COUNTRIES TO REDUCE THEIR NUCLEAR WEAPONS, EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT THIS WAS THE TYPE OF ARMAMENT WHICH SHOULD BE REDUCED AND, ON THEIR OWN INITIATIVE, THEY WISHED TO STATE THAT THEY WERE PREPARED TO REDUCE THEIR NUCLEAR WEAPONS STATIONED IN CENTRAL EUROPE. EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED THIS TO BE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00051 02 OF 04 172218Z

ONE MORE DEMONSTRATION OF THE SINCERE AND SERIOUS CHARACTER OF THE DESIRE OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES TO ACHIEVE A REDUCTION OF THE MILITARY CONFRONTATION IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

8. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS, THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY FOR ALL STATES, THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES PROPOSED TO CARRY OUT REDUCTION OF SOVIET AND AMERICAN TROOPS IN THE FIRST STAGE BY AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE. THE REDUCTION OF AMERICAN FORCES WOULD BE AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL MANPOWER OF THE NATO STATES AND THE SOVIET REDUCTION WOULD BE BY THE SAME PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL OF THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES' TROOPS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. SUCH A METHOD WOULD ASSURE THE EQUITABLE CHARACTER OF THE REDUCTIONS AND ENSURE THAT THE POSSIBILITY OF A CHANGE IN THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD BE AVERTED. WESTERN REPS, AND IN PARTICULAR THE US REP IN THE PRESENT SESSION, HAD REITERATED AGAIN THAT THEY AGREED WITH THE PREMISE THAT THE PRESENT TOTAL OR OVERALL RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE CANNOT BE CHANGED.

9. KHLESTOV STATED THAT AN IMPORTANT MERIT OF THE NEW EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS EMBODIED IN THE FACT THAT IT PROVIDED FOR REDUCTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY ENTIRE SUB-UNITS, UNITS AND OTHER FORMATIONS, WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE ARMAMENTS AND COMBAT EQUIPMENT. THIS WAS THE ONLY POSSIBLE WAY OF CARRYING OUT AN EFFECTIVE SOLUTION OF THE TASK OF DECREASING THE HIGH CONCENTRATION OF FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE WESTERN PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW AMERICAN SERVICEMEN SELECTED FROM DIFFERENT UNITS WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE A REAL REDUCTION OF AMERICAN TROOPS. AS EASTERN REPS COULD JUDGE ON THE BASIS OF CERTAIN STATEMENTS BY WESTERN LEADERS AND WESTERN PRESS REPORTS, IT WAS LIKELY THAT SUCH A METHOD OF REDUCTIONS CONFORMED NOT WITH THE PURPOSES OF THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS BUT RATHER WITH THOSE OF THE AMERICAN FORCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN CENTRAL EUROPE.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00051 03 OF 04 172227Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /084 W
----- 122820

O P 171912Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1428

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0051

FROM US REP MBFR

10. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE PROVISION IN THE EASTERN PROPOSAL SAYING THAT REDUCED FOREIGN TROOPS SHOULD NOT ONLY BE WITHDRAWN TO THEIR NATIONAL BOUNDARIES BUT ALSO BE DISBANDED ALSO WAS IMPORTANT. IN THE COURSE OF THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS, THE POSITION ASSUMED BY THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES HAD ALWAYS BEEN THAT, IN CARRYING OUT REDUCTIONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE, THE SECURITY OF ALL EUROPEAN STATES SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, INCLUDING THAT OF THE SO-CALLED FLANK STATES. IN PRACTICE ALL PREVIOUS EASTERN PROPOSALS HAD BEEN CONCEIVED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THIS AIM. NOW, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT OPINIONS PRESENTED IN VIENNA BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SO-CALLED FLANK STATES, EASTERN REPS WISH TO SUBMIT THIS ADDITIONAL PROVISION. THIS PROVISION CONSTITUTED AN ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE CAUSE OF DISARMAMENT WHICH WOULD SERVE THE INTERESTS OF ALL EUROPEAN STATES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00051 03 OF 04 172227Z

11. KHLESTOV SAID THAT WHEN HE HAD PRESENTED THE TEXT OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL, IT HAD MENTIONED BOTH THE DISBANDMENT OF THE SOVIET AND US TROOPS. THE SAME WAS NATURALLY TRUE WITH RESPECT TO THE FORCES OF GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA WHEN THEY WERE REDUCED IN THE SECOND STAGE IN 1977-1978.

12. THUS, KHLESTOV CONTINUED, THE NEW SOCIALIST PROPOSAL PROVIDED FOR EQUITABLE COMMITMENTS BY ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS ON THE MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS. THE PROPOSED REDUCTIONS COVERED ALL ARMED SERVICES AND ALL MILITARY PERSONNEL AND COMBAT EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS. ITS IMPLEMENTATION WOULD GIVE NO UNILATERAL MILITARY ADVANTAGE TO ANY ONE AND WOULD NOT DIMINISH THE SECURITY OF ANY STATE. IT WOULD PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN

CENTRAL EUROPE. THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES' DELEGATIONS CONSIDERED THAT THEIR NEW PROPOSAL ENABLED PARTICIPANTS TO TAKE A DECISIVE STEP TOWARD REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. SINCE THIS PROPOSAL TOOK INTO ACCOUNT MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE POSITION OF ALL THE STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE NEGOTIATIONS IN A WAY WHICH PROVIDED FOR AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, EASTERN REPS EXPECTED THAT THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE WESTERN STATES WOULD GIVE CAREFUL EXAMINATION TO THIS PROPOSAL AND ANSWER POSITIVELY.

13. US REP SAID THAT A COUPLE OF POINTS IN THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WERE NOT CLEAR. HE ASKED WHETHER THE EASTERN REPS WOULD BE PREPARED TO ANSWER A FEW QUESTIONS ON IT FOR THE SAKE OF CLARITY. KHLESTOV INDICATED HE WOULD ANSWER QUESTIONS. US REP ASKED WHETHER THE EAST WAS OFFERING THE WEST THE OPTION OF SELECTING BETWEEN A 2 PERCENT REDUCTION OR A 3 PERCENT REDUCTION. WHEN US REP PAUSED FOR A REPLY, KHLESTOV SAID HE WOULD PREFER TO TAKE ALL QUESTIONS BEFORE GIVING ANY REPLIES. US REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WOULD PREFER A ONE-BY-ONE RESPONSE, BUT HE WOULD BE WILLING TO POSE A FEW FURTHER FACTUAL QUESTIONS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES. US REP SAID HIS SECOND QUESTION WAS, IF THE US SELECTED 3 PERCENT, HOW MANY SOVIET FORCES WOULD BE REDUCED IN STAGE 1? KHLESTOV SAID HE WOULD ANSWER THIS QUESTION LATER.

14. FRG REP COMMENTED THAT KHLESTOV HAD SAID THAT IN THE FRAMEWORK OF A FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT OF US AND SOVIET WITHDRAWALS, THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD UNDERTAKE PRECISE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00051 03 OF 04 172227Z

COMMITMENTS TO FREEZE THEIR MANPOWER AND REDUCE THEIR FORCES. WHAT WOULD THIS MEAN IN PRACTICE? WHAT WAS THE NATURE OF THE COMMITMENT EXPECTED FROM THE OTHER REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN RESPECT TO THE SECOND STAGE? WERE THEY EXPECTED TO COMMIT THEMSELVES AS TO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF SECOND STAGE REDUCTIONS OR MERELY TO THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL REDUCTIONS? WHAT DID THIS ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL MEAN IN PRACTICE? KHLESTOV AGAIN INDICATED HE WOULD REPLY LATER.

US REP ASKED WHETHER THERE WOULD BE A CEILING ON THE LEVEL OF RESIDUAL SOVIET AND US MANPOWER IN THE AREA AFTER STAGE 1 REDUCTIONS AND IF SO, WOULD THESE CEILINGS BE EXPRESSED IN NUMBERS? WOULD THERE BE CEILINGS ON THE RESIDUAL LEVELS OF THOSE US AND SOVIET ARMAMENTS REDUCED AT THE END OF STAGE 1? WOULD THE US AND SOVIET BE EXPECTED TO REDUCE ARMAMENTS IN STAGE 1 OTHER THAN THOSE SPECIFIED IN THE EASTERN LIST OF ARMAMENTS? THE SOVIET REP HAD SPOKEN OF US AND SOVIET DISBANDING WITHDRAWN UNITS. DID THIS MEAN THAT THE EAST CONTEMPLATED A CEILING ON THE RESIDUAL LEVEL OF UNITS OF THE TYPE WITHDRAWN?

15. CANADIAN REP SAID EASTERN REPS HAD MENTIONED THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF A NON-INCREASE OR FREEZE AS A PART OF THEIR PROPOSAL.

WAS HE RIGHT IN TAKING THIS AS A FREEZE IN MANPOWER ONLY? WERE INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL LEVELS TO BE SPECIFIED, OR ONLY THE TOTAL NUMBER ON EACH SIDE? HOW WOULD THESE NUMBERS BE DETERMINED OR AGREED? WHAT WOULD BE THE DURATION OF THIS FREEZE? CANADIAN REP SAID HE ALSO WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT KHLESTOV HAD MEANT IN SAYING FORCES OF THE UK AND CANADA WOULD BE TREATED "THE SAME," IF ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT PROPOSAL THE LATTER WERE REDUCED IN 1977-1978.

16. KHLESTOV SAID HE WOULD ANSWER THE CANADIAN REP'S LAST QUESTION FIRST: ACCORDING TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL REDUCED SOVIET AND AMERICAN TROOPS WOULD BE WITHDRAWN TO THEIR HOME TERRITORY WHERE THEY WOULD BE DISBANDED. THE EAST WAS PROPOSING THAT THE SAME THING SHOULD HAPPEN TO WITHDRAWN CANADIAN AND UK FORCES IN THE SECOND PHASE IN 1977-1978.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00051 04 OF 04 172225Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-11 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00

SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /084 W
----- 122808

O P 171912Z FEB 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1429

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0051

FROM US REP MBFR

17. KHLESTOV THEN INDICATED THAT HE WAS NOT PREPARED TO ANSWER

FURTHER QUESTIONS. HE SAID PARTICIPANTS COULD CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION IN THE FOLLOWING SESSION.

18. US REP SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A FINAL COMMENT. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, US REP SAID THAT THE WESTERN REPS WOULD REPORT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL TO THEIR COLLEAGUES. IN DUE COURSE, ALLIED REPS WOULD LET THE EAST HAVE THEIR COMMENTS. HOWEVER, US REP SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO DRAW EASTERN REPS' ATTENTION AGAIN TO THE FACT THAT THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS ATTACHED GREAT IMPORTANCE TO THEIR NEW PROPOSALS WHICH HAD BEEN ON THE TABLE SINCE DEC 16. THESE DEC 16 PROPOSALS PROVIDED AN EQUITABLE AND COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTION TO THE MAJOR ISSUES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS, INCLUDING THE REQUIREMENT TO REACH APPROXIMATE PARITY IN GROUND FORCES. FOR THESE REASONS, WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT THEIR PROPOSALS REPRESENTED THE SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00051 04 OF 04 172225Z

RIGHT APPROACH TO AN AGREEMENT.

19. CZECHOSLOVAK REP SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON ONE POINT RAISED BY THE CANADIAN REP IN LATTER'S PRESENTATION. IN CZECHOSLOVAK REP'S OWN PLENARY REMARKS ON FEB 5, CZECHOSLOVAK REP HAD, IN FACT, MENTIONED THE IMPORTANCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. BUT HE HAD DONE SO WITH A DIFFERENT MEANING THAN THAT CITED BY CANADIAN REP. HE HAD SAID THAT NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS WERE VERY IMPORTANT AND SHOULD BE COVERED BY REDUCTIONS. CANADIAN REP SAID HE HAD UNDERSTOOD CZECHOSLOVAK REP'S PLENARY REMARKS CORRECTLY.

20. THE SESSION WAS CONCLUDED. IT WAS AGREED TO HOLD THE NEXT SESSION ON FEB 24. THE US WOULD BE HOST.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 17 FEB 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: morefirh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00051
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760059-0446
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760243/aaaablxm.tel
Line Count: 528
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 10
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 MBFR VIENNA 47
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: morefirh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 SEP 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29 SEP 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <06 JAN 2004 by morefirh>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF FEB 17, 1976
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006